9/9/2022

REFUSED FOR FILING

Sufreme court case No. 5-17874 is closed. Additionally, this Notice or remust for relief should be Filed in the suferior court.

Chief Deputy clerk

Mark N. Wayson 66063 S. Glacier Park Rd. Sutton, Alaska 99674 (907) 746-4570 markonwayson@yahoo.com APPELLATE COURT
STATE OF ALASKA
Judge Matthews

IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

MARK N.WAYSON,)	
Appellant)	
77)	Supreme Court No. S-17874 Superior Court No. 3AN-17-05729 CI
V.)	Superior Court No. 3AN-17-03729 Cr
WILLIAM E. STEVENSON,	j	
)	
Appellee)	

WITHDRAWAL OF OCTOBER 5, 2020, NOTICE APPOINTING CLERK OF THE COURT AS WAYSON'S AGENT

The Alaska Supreme Court has approved payment to counsels in Cases S-17874, and 3AN-17-05729, including for undisputed offenses listed in Wayson's October 5, 2020, "Payment of Supersedes Cash Bond and Qualifications of Wayson's Appointment of the Clerk of the Court as Wayson's Agent".

Judge Matthews' November 5, 2020 Order noted that Wayson's notice did comply with Civil Rule 80(g).

Stevenson v. Wayson Withdrawal of October 5, 2020, Notice Appointing Clerk of the Court as Wayson's Agent.
3AN-17-05729 CI

Nevertheless, Given the Absolute Power of the Supreme Court over lower courts, Wayson withdraws his 'Appointment of the Trial Court Clerk as his Agent', and relinquishes the dispersal of Wayson's \$59,735.64 Cash Bond to that designated by the Supreme Court and Trial Court.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2022, at Anchorage Alaska.

s/ Mark N. Wayson Appellant

l certify that this document was distributed to the Anchorage Trial Court Clerk, the Trial Court, the Supreme Court, and the Law Offices of Paul Waggoner on this 8th day of September, 2022, by Appellant Mark N Wayson

s/_Mark N. Wayson

Mark N. Wayson 66063 South Glacier Park Road Sutton, Alaska 99674 Telephone: 907-746-4570 markonwayson@yahoo.com OCT 6 5, 2020

APPELLATE COURTS
OF THE
STATE OF ALASKA



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

)
)) No. 3AN-17-05729 CI.
) No. 5AN-17-05729 Cl.
)
)))

PAYMENT OF SUPERSEDEAS CASH BOND AND QUALIFICATION OF WAYSON'S APPOINTMENT OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT AS WAYSON'S AGENT

Mark N. Wayson (hereinafter 'Wayson') pays a cash bond of Fifty-Nine Thousand, Seven Hundred and Thirty Dollars, and Sixty-Four Cents (\$59,735.64) as a Supersedeas bond to the Clerk of the Court, thereby making the Clerk of the Court Wayson's agent, with the following qualification.

The Law Firm of Richmond & Quinn of Anchorage, Alaska, and Paul W. Waggoner (hereinafter 'Waggoner') on behalf of William E. Stevenson (hereinafter 'Stevenson') specifically and indisputably defrauded Philadelphia Insurance Companies, Wayson, and the clients of Philadelphia Insurance Companies during litigation.

The Stevenson fraud was perpetuated by Waggoner using the Alaska Supreme Court as the forum to steal money through fraudulent Attorney Fees on October 24, and October 29, 2018.

In any impartial and ethical forum, Wayson cannot be ordered to participate in this fraud by Richmond & Quinn by paying any part of any Attorney Fees or Costs which have been tainted by criminal fraud. Nor does Wayson intend to involve the Clerk of the Court in any fraudulent action as Wayson's agent.

Fraud by Waggoner was brought to the Trial Court's specific attention by the Alaska Supreme Court on August 5, 2020, eight (8) days before the Trial Court's Final Judgment. The fraud was so brazen that it is unlikely that it was a one-time occurrence.

Evidence of other billing fraud by Richmond & Quinn and Waggoner were provided to the Trial Court, 'misinterpreted' or disregarded by the Trial Court, and are on Appeal. The fraud information provided by Wayson, as well as the observations of the Court, screamed for an investigation of the offenses, rather than the Trial Court sweeping them under the rug, because the crimes were committed by the Court's colleagues in private practice.

The Trial Courts effectively have provided their 'impartial forum' in the form of a sanctuary in which Stevenson has been allowed to commit fraud and other criminal offenses in his civil case because Stevenson participated in the Alaska 'pay-to-play' system by hiring attorneys as his criminal surrogates to carry out his offenses in the Court System.

Allowing only lawyers to file defamation third-party lawsuits requiring no 'legal' skills, is an unfair restriction on competition and violation of Federal and State Anti-Trust statutes.

This complicity, and the Trial Court's disregard of Judicial Canons requiring diligence, impartiality, and equal treatment of all Alaskans, including lawyers, is emblematic of Stevenson v. Wayson and further erodes what public trust there is in the Alaska Legal System.

DATED this day of October, 2020, at Anchorage, Alaska.

> Mark N. Wayson Defendant

I certify that this document was distributed via U.S. Postal Service to: Paul Waggoper on this 5 day of 12 2020 by Defendant Mark N. Wayson.

Receipt Type Case

Outstanding Amount

0.00

Receipt Number 1784376

Receipt Date

10/05/2020

Case Number 3AN-17-05729CI

Description Stevenson, William E vs. Wayson, Mark N

Received From Wayson, Mark N, Defendant

On Behalf Of Stevenson, William E

Itemized Listing:

Description

Amount

Civil Deposit Posted

59,735.64

Receipt Payments

Amount Reference Description

Check/Money Order

59,735.64

1405

	• • • • • •	Received Received	59,735.64 59,735.64
İ		Change	0.00

Comments

Deputy Register

mlawrence Transaction Date

10/05/2020 10:17:12.18

UCT US 2020

APPELLATE COURT OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT ANCHORAGE WILLIAM E. STEVENSON, Plaintiff, V. MARK N. WAYSON, Defendant. Case No. 3AN-17-05729Ci

ORDER DENYING STEVENSON'S MOTION RE RULE 80(g) COMPLIANCE

Following protracted proceedings in this matter, Final Judgment was entered on August 14, 2020 in favor of Plaintiff William Stevenson and against Defendant Mark Wayson. The Court also granted Stevenson's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs, and awarded him a total sum in the amount of \$59,735.64. On September 8, 2020, Wayson filed a Motion to approve cash deposit in the amount of \$59,735.64 in lieu of a supersedes bond, and requested a stay pending appeal pursuant to Civil Rule 62(d). Stevenson did not oppose Wayson's request, and the Court granted Wayson's Motion on October 1, 2020.

On October 5, Stevenson deposited the required sum of \$59,735.64 with the Court and provided a written notice of qualified appointment of the Clerk of Court as Wayson's Agent. On October 9, 2020, Stevenson filed the present Motion to require compliance with Civil Rule 80(g). Wayson opposes the Motion. The filings were made in the trial court and not with the appellate court. Nonetheless, this Court believes it still has jurisdiction to address the pending motion.¹

When a judgment is entered, Civil Rule 62(d) permits the judgment debtor to obtain a stay of enforcement by either posting a bond, or filing a cash deposit in lieu of a bond while he pursues an appeal. The bond or cash deposit are provided as security to ensure the judgment debtor can satisfy the judgment if it is affirmed on appeal. Civil Rule 80(g) permits a cash deposit in lieu of a surety bond to be made with the clerk of

¹ See eg Hertz v Carothers, 174 P3d 243, 249 (Alaska 2008).

court. When the deposit is made, "there shall be filed a written instrument properly executed and acknowledged by the owner of the cash . . . setting forth the conditions under which the deposit is being made, . . . "²

Wayson did file a "written instrument" with his cash deposit. That writing also sets forth various accusations, and assertions which might be called "conditions." Nonetheless, Stevenson disputes whether Wayson's filing complies with the rule. In the Court's view, Wayson's filing is outside the spirit of the rule as it sets forth multiple accusations against Stevenson, his counsel, and the Court. The accusations generally suggest that he is filing the cash deposit under protest. Wayson's written notice with his deposit clearly does not include the specific condition that Stevenson wants — automatic payment of the attorney's fee award if the appeal results in an affirmance of the judgment. It is also true that Stevenson will have to file a request to release the cash deposit if he prevails upon the appeal. But despite Stevenson's argument, the Court cannot say that Wayson's filling does not include "conditions." In the Court's view, Wayson's notice, broadly viewed, complies with Civil Rule 80(g).

For the foregoing reasons, Stevenson's Motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 5th day of November, 2020.

Thomas A. Matthews Superior Court Judge

of the following was materal axellfrond delivered 90 to each of the following at their addresses of record.

Mark Wayson

² See Alaska R. Cív. P. 80(g).